



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/412,284	10/05/1999	GRAHAM P. ALLAWAY	43966-CA-PCT	9473

7590

02/03/2003

JOHN P WHITE
COOPER AND DUNHAM LLP
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

PARKIN, JEFFREY S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2003

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/412,284

Applicant(s)

ALLAWAY ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 20. 6) ☐ Other:

Serial No.: 09/412,284
Applicants: Allaway, G., et al.

Docket No.: 43966-CA-PCT
Filing Date: 10/05/99

Detailed Office Action

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request filed on 25 October, 2002, for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/412,284 is acceptable and a CPA has been established.

5

Status of the Claims

2. The amendment submitted 26 March, 2002, has been entered. Claims 7, 9, 10, 18, and 19 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 15-17 are currently pending in the instant application.

10

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement filed 13 December, 2002, has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

15

35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

20

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

25

5. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In

30

re *Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 U.S.P.Q. 323 (C.C.P.A. 1981). In
re *Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 U.S.P.Q. 90 (C.C.P.A. 1976). To
satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification
must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one
5 skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had
possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc., v.*
Mahurkar, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1116. The issue
raised in this application is whether the original application
provides adequate support for the broadly claimed genus of
10 antibodies that are capable of inhibiting the fusion of macrophage-
tropic HIV-1 isolates to the appropriate cell targets. An
applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing
the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such
descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, and
15 formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v.*
American Airlines, Inc., 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1961,
1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The claimed invention as a whole may not be
adequately described where an invention is described solely in
terms of a method of its making coupled with its function and there
20 is no described or art-recognized correlation or relationship
between the structure of the invention and its function. A
biomolecule sequence described only by functional characteristic,
without any known or disclosed correlation between that function
and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient
25 identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even
when accompanied by a method of obtaining the biomolecule of
interest. In *re Bell*, 991 F.2d 781, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529 (Fed. Cir.
1993). In *re Deuel*, 51 F.3d 1552, 34 U.S.P.Q.2d 1210 (Fed. Cir.
1995). A lack of adequate written description issue also arises if
30 the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one
skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from
the disclosed process. See, e.g., *Fujikawa v. Wattanasin*, 93 F.3d

1559, 1571, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1995). The court noted in this decision that a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not reasonably lead those skilled in the art to any particular species.

An applicant may show possession of an invention by disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that are sufficiently detailed to show that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention as a whole. An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics. For some biomolecules, examples of identifying characteristics include a nucleotide or amino acid sequence, chemical structure, binding affinity, binding specificity, and molecular weight. The written description requirement may be satisfied through disclosure of function and minimal structure when there is a well-established correlation between structure and function. Without such a correlation, the capability to recognize or understand the structure from the mere recitation of function and minimal structure is highly unlikely. In the latter case, disclosure of function alone is little more than a wish for possession; it does not satisfy the written description requirement. *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 U.S.P.Q.2d 1398, 1404, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997), cert. denied, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 1521, 222 U.S.P.Q. 369, 372-3 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Factors to be considered in determining whether there is sufficient evidence of possession include the level of skill and

knowledge in the art, partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics alone or coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function, and the method of making the claimed invention.

5 The disclosure (see p. 60) describes the isolation and preparation of four hybridomas (designated PA-3, -5, -6, and -7) that secrete antibodies that are capable of inhibiting HeLa-env_{JR-FL} fusion to PM1 cells in an *in vitro* RET assay. However, no detailed structural or functional characterizations of the monoclonal
10 antibodies produced by these hybridomas was provided. No detailed structural characterization was performed pertaining to the antigenic determinants recognized by said hybridoma supernatants. Thus, the binding specificity and coding potential of the antibodies has not been clearly ascertained. The skilled artisan
15 would reasonably conclude that applicants were in possession of these four hybridomas. However, the binding specificity of these antibodies remains to be elucidated. Thus, it is not readily manifest if these antibodies have the claimed characteristics (e.g., inhibition of macrophage-tropic virus fusion without
20 inhibiting T-cell-tropic isolates). Since the disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the structure of the claimed antibodies, the structure of the recognized antigenic determinants, and a reproducible method for making antibodies with the desired phenotype, inadequate written support exists for the
25 claimed invention.

6. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is
30 most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims are broadly directed toward antibodies that are capable of inhibiting macrophage-tropic HIV-1 isolate fusion to a suitable target cell

without inhibiting T-cell-tropic isolate fusion to a suitable target cell. The disclosure describes the isolation and preparation (see p. 60) of four hybridomas (designated PA-3, PA-5, PA-6, and PA-7) that secrete antibodies that are capable of inhibiting HeLa-env_{JR-FL} fusion to PM1 cells in an *in vitro* RET assay. However, no detailed structural or functional characterizations of the monoclonal antibodies produced by these hybridomas was provided. No detailed structural characterization was performed pertaining to the antigenic determinants recognized by said hybridoma supernatants. Thus, the binding specificity and coding potential of the antibodies has not been clearly ascertained.

The legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation are disclosed in *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988) and *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded that several factual inquiries should be considered when making such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows:

- 1) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the structural requirements of any given antibody. Antibodies are large and complex molecules comprised of two ~55 kDa heavy chain polypeptides and two ~25 kDa light chain polypeptides (Frazer and Capra, 1999). Within each chain are relatively constant regions and highly variable regions. It is the highly variable regions of these molecules that dictate many of the functional properties of

the antibody such as antigen binding specificity. However, it is well-known in the art that antibody structure is highly variable due to the genetic diversity of the antibody locus (Max, 1999). The recombinatorial events involved in antibody production can produce 32 million different combinations. Thus, the skilled artisan cannot predict what the structure of any given antibody will be.

2) The disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the structure of the antigenic determinants recognized by the antibodies of interest. Antibody-antigen binding interactions generally involve between five to eight amino acids. However, single amino acid changes the antigenic determinant can drastically reduce or completely abrogate antigen-antibody binding (Mateu et al., 1992; Alexander et al., 1992). Thus, in order to reproducibly generate antibodies with the desired characteristics, the skilled artisan would require a knowledge of the antigenic determinants modulating this interaction. However, the specification is silent pertaining to this point.

3) The disclosure fails to provide a reproducible method for making antibodies with the claimed specificity. As noted *supra* in points one and two, there is considerable unpredictability pertaining to the generation of antibodies with the desired properties and characteristics. While the specification provides a generic method for producing antibodies, it fails to provide any reproducible methodologies for obtaining antibodies with the desired characteristics.

4) The claims are broadly directed toward a large genus of antibodies without providing sufficient structural and functional support pertaining to the properties of said antibodies.

5) The disclosure fails to provide a sufficient number of working embodiments. While four hybridomas were generated, the precise structural and functional characteristics of these antibodies were

never clearly set forth.

6) The prior art is unpredictable and fails to provide any guidance pertaining to those macrophage-tropic-specific immunogenic/antigenic determinants that can be used to produce antibodies with the desired binding specificity. As noted *supra* in points one and two, considerable unpredictability was present in the art at the time of filing. However, the disclosure fails to address any of these concerns.

7) Legal precedence dictates that the scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 U.S.P.Q. 18, 24 (C.C.P.A. 1970). *In re Vaeck*, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (C.A.F.C. 1991). *In re Angstadt*, 537 F.2d 498, 502-03, 190 U.S.P.Q. 214, 218 (C.C.P.A. 1976). Thus, when all the aforementioned factors are considered *in toto*, it would clearly require undue experimentation from the skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention.

7. Applicants traverse and argue the claims are fully enabled. A declaration was provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 by Dr. Paul J. Maddon in support. Dr. Maddon asserted that methods for preparing the antibodies of interest were available at the time of filing. The Examiner does not dispute the finding that generic methods of preparing and isolating antibodies were available. The problem is that a reproducible method that produces antibodies with the specifically claimed characteristics was not provided. There is considerable uncertainty pertaining to the generation of antibodies as set forth *supra*. Since the disclosure fails to identify the immunogenic/antigenic determinant(s) of interest and the structure of any given antibody, the skilled artisan has been extended an undue invitation to further experimentation. Moreover, the claims are directed toward a specific chemical compound (e.g., antibody) with defined structure and binding characteristics. However, the


disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to these structural and functional considerations. Moreover, the declaration provided by Dr. Maddon fails to address these caveats. It only discloses generic methods of preparation and fails to provide any further illumination pertaining to the immunogenic/antigenic determinants modulating the antigen/antibody binding interactions and fails to provide any guidance pertaining to the structure of any given antibody.

Correspondence

8. Correspondence related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Official communications should be directed toward one of the following Group 1600 fax numbers: (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014. Informal communications may be submitted directly to the Examiner through the following fax number: (703) 308-4426. Applicants are encouraged to notify the Examiner prior to the submission of such documents to facilitate their expeditious processing and entry.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-2227. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, James Housel or Laurie Scheiner, can be reached at (703) 308-4027 or (703) 308-1122, respectively. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Respectfully,


Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1648

10 January, 2003